

To: Davis, Alison[Davis.Alison@epa.gov]; Strauss, Linda[Strauss.Linda@epa.gov]; Gillis, Chris[Gillis.Chris@epa.gov]
From: Flattery, Priscilla
Sent: Tue 1/14/2014 8:39:33 PM
Subject: RE: Fact Check - PLEASE RED

The second bullet is not correct. There was no stated presumption in TSCA that they were safe. They were grandfathered in with no requirement that they be tested for safety.

Priscilla Flattery

Chief of Staff, OPPT

202-564-2718

From: Davis, Alison
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 3:33 PM
To: Flattery, Priscilla; Strauss, Linda; Gillis, Chris
Subject: Fact Check - PLEASE RED

Put ahead of the other request please. Alisha asking.

From: Asfour, Nana <Nana_Asfour@newyorker.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 1:06:15 PM
To: Milbourn, Cathy
Subject: URGENT: Fact-checking article on the WV water contamination

Dear Cathy,

I am a fact-checker at the New Yorker magazine and I'm working on an article about the water contamination in West Virginia for our online version. I would like to confirm that the following information on MCHM, the chemical leaked into the water, is accurate:

**MCHM is one of the 62,000 chemicals that were already in use when TSCA, the country's main chemical safety law, was passed in 1976.

**All of these chemicals were presumed to be safe, and EPA was not required to determine their safety.

**To require testing of these chemicals under TSCA, EPA must first provide evidence that the chemical may pose a risk.

I hope you can get back to me soon. We would like to publish this article this afternoon.